

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 are pending in the application, where claim 16 had been previously canceled and claims 21-22 had been previously added. Claims 1 and 18 are independent. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1, 6-8, 11-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 2,806,968 (Thorington), and rejects claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Thorington in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,723,937 (Whitman). Further, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Thorington in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,137,230 (Born), and claims 5 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Thorington. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-15 and 17-22 are patentable over Thorington, Whitman and Born for at least the following reasons.

Thorington is directed to a lamp having an outer envelope 22 shown in FIG 1. As shown in FIG 3, the inner surface of the outer envelope 22 is coated with a mixture of phosphor particles 35a and fine particles of silica. The fine silica particles form a coating 39 over the phosphor particles 35a. FIG 3 shows the silica coated phosphor particles touching each other. However, as clearly shown in FIG 3, the silica coated phosphor particles do NOT physically overlap each other.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 18, amongst other patentable elements requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

the structured arrangements physically overlapping over each other so that a first structured arrangement is in physical contact with a second structured arrangement.

A pattern that includes structured arrangements that are physically overlapping over each other so that a first structured arrangement is in physical contact with a second structured arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Thorington. Rather, the Thorington silica coated phosphor particles shown in FIG 3

merely contact each other. Whitman and Born are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Thorington.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 18 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15, 17 and 19-22 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 18 as well as their individually patentable elements. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dicran Halajian  
Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
February 16, 2009

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Phone: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101